



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,891	02/08/2006	Henning Von Spreckelsen	FIL-001	7288
22832	7590	06/23/2009	EXAMINER	
K&L Gates LLP STATE STREET FINANCIAL CENTER One Lincoln Street BOSTON, MA 02111-2950			HYLTON, ROBIN ANNETTE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3781	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/567,891

**Applicant(s)**

VON SPRECKELSEN ET AL.

**Examiner**

ROBIN HYLTON

**Art Unit**

3781

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 2008 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings were received on December 22, 2008. These drawings are not approved. The newly added Fig.7 adds new matter to the original disclosure. There is no support that the drawing as newly presented is the only representation of applicant's invention at the time the application was filed. This is a new matter rejection.

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the plastic material in the cross sectional views and the two spaced parallel legs rooted side by side on the peninsula (as set forth in claim 6) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. MPEP § 608.02(d) depicts plastic as alternating thick and thin lines.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant

will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show plastic material as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d) depicts plastic as alternating thick and thin lines. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spreckelsen et al. (GB 2,353,789 and GB 2,377,701) in view of Mavin et al. (EP 1,266,839). It is noted the claims are drawn to a closure only.

Spreckelsen discloses a closure comprising a spout, a removable plastic part connected to the spout by frangible means, a pulling device attached to the removable plastic part by a leg, and a sealing means between the pulling device and the removable plastic part. Spreckelsen does not disclose the leg is attached to a peninsula of the removable part to tear the sealing means.

Mavin teaches it is known to provide a peninsula portion as claimed for foil sealed closures with opening devices in order to prevent a dissipation of the pulling force to assure the application of the pulling force on a predefined, comparatively small region of the plastic part that is attached to the sealing means.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of a peninsula structure to the removable plastic part of Spreckelsen. Doing so prevents a dissipation of the pulling force to assure the application of the pulling force on a predefined, comparatively small region of the plastic part that is attached to the sealing means.

Other claimed features of the instant invention would have been an obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made since the features would have involved substituting known equivalent structures for a pull device and/or removable plastic part.

6. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawajiri et al. (US 4,948,015) in view of Mavin et al. (EP 1,266,839). It is noted the claims are drawn to a closure only.

Kawajiri discloses a closure comprising a spout, a removable plastic part connected to the spout by frangible means, a pulling device attached to the removable plastic part by a leg, and a sealing means between the pulling device and the removable plastic part. Kawajiri does not disclose the leg is attached to a peninsula of the removable part to tear the sealing means.

Mavin teaches it is known to provide a peninsula portion as claimed for foil sealed closures with opening devices in order to prevent a dissipation of the pulling force to assure the application of the pulling force on a predefined, comparatively small region of the plastic part that is attached to the sealing means.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of a peninsula structure to the removable plastic part of Kawajiri. Doing so prevents a dissipation of the pulling force to assure the application of the pulling force on a predefined, comparatively small region of the plastic part that is attached to the sealing means.

Other claimed features of the instant invention would have been an obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made since the features would have involved substituting known equivalent structures for a pull device and/or removable plastic part.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed December 22, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. Applicant argues the claim limitations are not met by the prior art as set forth above since "Mavin relates to the *peeling* of a foil, not the *tearing* of a foil". It is noted that the claims are drawn only to a closure, not to the closure and a seal. Moreover, it has been held that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In the instant case, the structure of the modified closure of Spreckelsen and Kawajiri both structurally meet the claimed invention of a closure capable of tearing a seal.

The base references of Spreckelsen and Kawajiri both disclose a closure for tearing a seal. The feature not taught by either reference is a leg is attached to a peninsula of the removable part to tear the sealing means. The teaching can, however, be found in Mavin. Adding this structural feature to the closures of Spreckelsen and Kawajiri would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention and would still render both closures to Spreckelsen and Kawajiri capable of tearing a seal, as disclosed therein.

Applicant further states the teachings of "Spreckelsen and Kawajiri do not cure the deficiencies of Mavin". However, this is a misinterpretation of the rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Applicant is duly reminded that a complete response must satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.111, including: "The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. A general allegation that the claims "define a patentable invention" without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. Moreover, "The prompt development of a clear issue requires that the replies of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims." Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP 2163.06 II(A), MPEP 2163.06 and MPEP 714.02. The "disclosure" includes the claims, the specification and the drawings.

11. In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3720/80 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (571) 273-8300. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into Group 3720/80 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

12. It is called to applicant's attention that if a communication is faxed before the reply time has expired, applicant may submit the reply with a "Certificate of Facsimile" which merely asserts that the reply is being faxed on a given date. So faxed, before the period for reply has expired, the reply may be considered timely. A suggested format for a certificate follows:

I hereby certify that this correspondence for Application Serial No. \_\_\_\_\_ is being facsimiled to The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via fax number 571-273-8300 on the date shown below:

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robin Hylton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4540. The examiner



Art Unit: 3781

can normally be reached Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. (Eastern time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Stashick, can be reached on (571) 272-4561.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Other helpful telephone numbers are listed for applicant's benefit:

- Allowed Files & Publication (888) 786-0101
- Assignment Branch (800) 972-6382
- Certificates of Correction (703) 305-8309
- Fee Questions (571) 272-6400
- Inventor Assistance Center (800) PTO-9199
- Petitions/special Programs (571) 272-3282
- Information Help line 1-800-786-9199
- Internet PTO-Home Page <http://www.uspto.gov>

June 21, 2009

/Robin A. Hylton/  
Robin A. Hylton  
Primary Examiner  
GAU 3781